

ensures the continued safety, affordability, and reliability of our food supply while achieving real savings in Federal spending. We reformed the VA to address the horrific wait times our veterans face while trying to receive the health care they earned. And we passed a spending agreement that brings discretionary spending to its lowest level in almost a decade and has a number of provisions that adhere to conservative principles.

Both parties did not get everything they wanted in any of these instances, but the final product was the result of individuals coming from different starting points and arriving at the same finish line. That is what the American people want, but that takes an honest commitment from all parties involved.

One way the President can show he is really ready to work with Congress is to abandon his misguided plan to circumvent Congress and grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants. I anticipate that President Obama will try tonight, once again, to defend his actions by blaming Congress for not passing immigration reform. The truth is everyone in this Chamber is eager to tackle immigration reform.

The President is acting unilaterally because he knows Congress does not support his amnesty proposal. He knows the final product of our work will not include that provision. So he intends to go around Congress to get his way. Now the President seems intent to dig his heels in deeper by threatening to veto our efforts to defund his actions. This is just one of the veto threats President Obama has already issued just weeks into the new Congress. This start doesn't bode well for bipartisanship.

I hope tonight's speech is light on the veto threats and heavy on the areas where we can find common agreement. I think those are plentiful, and I sincerely believe it is possible.

A fair and simple tax system, creating jobs, and making Washington more efficient, effective and accountable—these are the issues that Americans want us to address and areas where compromise is possible. That is where our focus should be and what the country wants—not just what the President wants.

If everyone comes to the table ready to work, I think we can surprise everyone with what we can achieve. But it will take Presidential leadership. An Arkansan showed it can be done. President Obama should look to the example of President Clinton for how to move forward and to work with a Republican Congress.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Markey/Baldwin amendment No. 13 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that oil transported through the Keystone XL Pipeline into the United States is used to reduce U.S. dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

Portman/Shahen amendment No. 3 (to amendment No. 2), to promote energy efficiency.

Cantwell (for Franken) amendment No. 17 (to amendment No. 2), to require the use of iron, steel, and manufactured goods produced in the United States in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are back on the bill before us, a measure that would allow for the permit to be approved to allow for construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline from Canada into the United States. We had good discussion last week, certainly on Friday.

We have several amendments that are pending before the body. The Senator from Massachusetts has one on oil exports, Senator PORTMAN on energy efficiency, and there is another measure sponsored by Senator FRANKEN relating to American steel. Obviously, it is important that we begin to process these amendments because we have a significant amount of interest in the issues in front of us. At this point in time there are—we had over 50 filed amendments as of Friday evening. As of this morning, we maybe have more on deck. There is clearly a great deal of interest not only on Keystone XL but other energy-related amendments as well.

As we work through finalizing the events for this afternoon, I would like to alert Members that we would like to have votes on at least the three pending amendments that are before us that I just mentioned, hopefully by midafternoon. We are aware the Senate will close early today because of the President's State of the Union this evening. So my hope is that we would be able to process these three.

It has come to our attention that Senator PORTMAN's amendment may need to be modified. He is in the process of doing that, and it may be that we will be able to accept that amendment this afternoon by voice vote.

At this point in time, I would encourage Members to come to us as the floor managers here, and let's figure out how we can get these amendments pending before the Senate. On the Republican side we have three folks who are queued up ready to offer theirs when it is appropriate. As we had agreed last week, we will go from side to side in terms of the amendments that will be considered. Hopefully this will be the beginning of a good, constructive week as we turn to regular order here in the Senate processing amendments.

With that, I would turn to my colleague on the energy committee, Senator CANTWELL, for any comments she might care to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, just to reiterate our opposition to this legislation, new polling has come out showing that the American public really does—over 60 percent—support going through a normal process and not subverting what are environmental laws. But we are going to move forward in getting this legislation voted on. My colleague just outlined a process for this afternoon. So I would encourage Members to come to the floor to offer their amendments. I know Senator FRANKEN is coming to speak on his amendment, and I see the Senator from Massachusetts here to speak on his amendment. So hopefully while they are speaking we can get a vote schedule firmed up and talk about other amendments besides the three we have pending. But I would agree with the Senator from Alaska that Members should come down here and talk on their amendments and we should keep the process moving.

With that, I am not sure who is queued up to speak.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I believe the sponsor of this legislation, Senator HOEVEN, would like to address the Chamber for a few minutes this afternoon not only on the amendments that are pending but the bigger picture of Keystone XL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. May I inquire of the Senator from Alaska and Senator HOEVEN how long he intends to speak to make sure our colleague from Massachusetts knows he has his time before we get locked out for lunch?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, my inquiry would be: How much time does the Senator from Massachusetts need? I would be willing to defer my time until later, as long as I know I would have approximately 10 minutes before the hard break of 12:30 p.m.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would think that if it is OK to allow the Senator from Massachusetts to proceed, knowing that our hard stop is 12:30 p.m., that at least—I would make this request: that both Senators be allowed to speak for 10 minutes, starting

with Senator MARKEY, followed by Senator HOEVEN. If they want to extend their remarks, they can make a unanimous consent request to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. May I ask a parliamentary inquiry. It would be this. Is it possible for me to speak for 5 minutes, then reserve the remainder of my time and have the Senator from North Dakota speak, and then I can reclaim the remainder of my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will take unanimous consent.

Mr. HOEVEN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are about to engage in a historic debate; that is, over whether the Canadians—a Canadian oil company—should be allowed to take the dirtiest oil in the world, the Canadian tar sands oil, to have the United States accede to the construction of a pipeline, like a straw through our country, which would then go down to the Gulf of Mexico, with no promise from the Canadians that they will not export the oil from the United States.

So the issue which is raised, of course, is what is in it for the United States, since there is a very small number of jobs for our country once the pipeline is completed? We understand why the Canadian company wants to do this. If they can get that oil out onto the global marketplace, using the United States as the conduit, they can get a dramatically higher price for that oil. We understand their motivation. But what is in it for the United States of America?

Ultimately, we have to decide what is in our best interests. My amendment says that if this pipeline is constructed, the oil stays here, our country gets the benefit, and our consumers get the benefit. Otherwise, it is not about energy independence; it is not about North American energy independence. It is about a Canadian company exporting the oil, using the United States as a conduit, as a straw, as a pipeline. That is it. What is in it for us?

The American people right now are enjoying historically low oil prices. They love it. It is like a tax cut to every American. If this Canadian oil gets exported, you better believe it is going to act as a spur to raise the price of oil. The more oil that is here, the better for us. The more oil that leaves our country, the worse for us.

I will give you another number, if you want to know, because this is a Canadian export pipeline. The United States of America right now is the leading importing country for oil in the world. We are No. 1. We import net about 5 million barrels of oil a day. We are No. 1. We are the No. 1 importing country. Then comes China, then

comes India, then Japan. Five million barrels a day—how can we be exporting oil when we are the leading importer of oil?

What countries do we import the oil from today, 2015? We import the oil from Saudi Arabia, from Venezuela, from Iraq, from Russia, from Nigeria. How can we be exporting our young men and women in uniform over to the Middle East in order to protect these ships coming in with oil in them and simultaneously be exporting oil out of the United States, while we are still importing 5 million barrels of oil a day?

That is what this debate is all about. It does not make any sense. This is the dirtiest oil in the world. This oil is going to dangerously add to the warming of the planet. The Canadian—the American Petroleum Institute will not promise the oil stays here, even though their ads on TV say that it is all about North American energy independence.

So we have a huge choice we have to make here. Do we want to help our economy? Do we want to help our national security, help our consumers, help our manufacturers by giving them this lower price of energy—which except for labor is the No. 1 component in industry in the United States—and keep that price low? The Markey amendment says: Yes, that oil stays here in the United States of America for our own strength, our own economy, our own consumers, our own job creation, and will not be sent off onto the world so the Canadian oil company can get a much higher price for that oil while we take all of the risk. We would not be Uncle Sam, we would be Uncle Sucker if we did not keep that oil here.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to engage in a discussion with my colleague from Massachusetts on the important issues. He has raised several issues in regard to oil export and then also in regard to the environmental aspects.

If I could take a minute to address both of those, for starters, I would point out that it is interesting that the Senator, my good friend from Massachusetts, is opposed to this pipeline project and talks about our need to import oil, and therefore we should not allow any exports, because we need to import oil. Yet he is opposed to a project that would not only bring Canadian oil to our country, 830,000 barrels a day, but also would help us move 100,000 barrels of oil a day from my State of North Dakota and my neighboring State of Montana—light sweet Bakken crude. So he objects to that, and he talks about our need to import oil. The irony here is that if he is successful and he and the other critics or opponents of this pipeline and the infrastructure are successful, then what Canada will do is they will build a pipeline to the west coast of Canada, and they will export that oil to China—100 percent of it.

So it appears that his argument is that because some portion of this oil may be exported if we build the pipeline, somehow it is better to force Canada to export 100 percent of it to China. Now, I do not begin to understand that argument. So if we cannot have 100 percent—every single drop—stay here, then we are better off to send all 100 percent to China. That is my opponent's argument. I do not understand it. It does not make sense to me.

The second point I would like to make is if he goes to the environmental impact statement issued by the Obama State Department, the environmental impact statement says that the oil would be used in the United States. If he looks at the Obama administration's Department of Energy report, he will see that the report also indicates that this oil is going to be used in the United States.

Now, that does not mean that we use every drop of it. I will give you some statistics. The United States retains 99 percent of all crude oil within the country that we produce. The United States uses 97 percent of the gasoline that we refine in this country. So, remember, this oil comes to refineries in Patoka, IL, and to the gulf coast. It goes to Cushing, and it gets refined.

The statistics are that we use 97 percent of that gasoline from oil that is refined in our country. The other thing I would point out is that the oil that comes in on this pipeline, along with the crude that comes from the Bakken, is both Canadian and domestic oil. That cannot be exported without approval from the Secretary of Commerce of the Obama administration.

So here again, my good friend from Massachusetts is putting forth an amendment that absolutely no oil in this one pipeline can be exported at any time to anywhere from the country, yet they already have provisions in law that it cannot be exported without the Secretary of Commerce's approval. The Secretary of Commerce is appointed by President Obama.

So, again, if you look at the administration's own reports, and they have been done over more than 6 years that this project has been pending—the administration now has had 6 years to review this project, has done so, and has produced five environmental impact statements. The conclusion of those environmental impact statements is “no significant environmental impact.” That is the administration's own environmental impact statements produced by the State Department.

But after 6 years, they have come out and said: This oil will be used here, and to be exported, it would have to be approved by the Secretary of Commerce, as other oil exports are handled in this country. Furthermore, if we do not build the pipeline, it is either all going to be sent to China—so then we would not get any of it—or we are going to have to move it via railcars—1,400 railcars a day, creating more congestion on our railways.

So at this point, I would inquire as to how much time I have used of my 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. At this point, I would yield back to my good friend from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator very much. Year 2014 has just been reported by NASA as the single warmest year ever recorded in the history of the planet, going back to the earliest records. You do not have to be a detective to figure out what is going on. The world is dangerously warming. The United States can no longer preach temperance from a bar stool and tell the rest of the world they should be better while we continue to burn these fuels.

But if they are going to build this pipeline, at least the American people should be the beneficiaries of the Canadian activity to sell all of this oil out onto the global market. What we are being told is: No, we do not want any restrictions. We do not want there to be any way in which we can keep that oil here, to keep prices at least low for the American consumer and for American job creation, to keep oil here so we can maybe back out the Saudi Arabian oil, maybe back out the Kuwaiti oil, maybe back out the Russian oil that we are importing right now as we sit here. But we are being told we cannot do that. We are being told the Republican leadership thinks that is a bad idea.

When I asked the head of the Trans-Canada pipeline in the hearing if he agree to keep the oil in the United States, he just looked at me and said no. So this is what is going on.

What happens for the American consumer? Well, I will tell you what happens. It is a very simple formula. Every time there is a \$10 increase in the price of a barrel of oil, it knocks two-tenths of a point to three-tenths of a percentage point off of the growth rate of the American economy.

When Americans pay less for American oil and we import less foreign oil, consumers have more money in their pockets from that discounted American oil. That is like a direct economic stimulus for middle-class families and small businesses across the country. Analysts say the drop in oil prices will give hundreds of billions back to consumers and other parts of our economy. Every penny reduction in gas prices translates into \$1 billion in consumer savings.

So when the polling is done on this issue and the American people are asked if they would support the exportation of American oil, by a 3-to-1 margin people say, all across the country, regardless of party: No, do not export it. Keep that oil here to make America stronger here at home.

That is not Democrat. That is not Republican. That is not Independent.

That is all people being polled across the board.

That is just common sense because they know the more oil we export, the higher the prices are going to be for consumers here because we have less oil. This is a simple debate.

The planet is running a fever. There are no emergency rooms for planets. We have to engage in preventive care. The Republican leadership thinks they have the votes in order to pass this bill which will dangerously warm the planet. My amendment says if that is going to be the case—and I am not voting for that bill—at least let's keep the oil here, at least let's get the benefit for consumers so we keep prices low for gasoline, prices low for home heating oil, prices low for jet fuel, prices low for diesel. Let's keep the oil here, let's get the benefit in our economy, and let's not allow oil companies to set the agenda.

The Republican leadership keeps saying it is all of the above. Ladies and gentlemen, this bill basically says: No. No, it is oil above all. That is what it is all about. It is not even oil that is necessarily going to stay in the United States, so it is a very simple argument I am making.

We import 5 million barrels of oil a day. They come from the worst places in the world that we should be dependent upon—5 million barrels a day. We export young men and women over to the Middle East to protect that oil coming in. The least we owe to those young men and women is when we get a chance to reduce our dependence upon imported oil, we take that chance, that we send that message to the rest of the world that we understand our Achilles's heel. We understand what makes us weak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I urge an "aye" vote on the Markey amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I appreciate this debate. It is an important debate to have. Clearly, the Senator from Massachusetts and I have very different ideas about how this should be addressed, but this is the debate we should have. This is about the energy future we are building for this country.

I am pleased we are engaged in this debate. Let's work to build the kind of energy plan that is going to truly make our country energy secure.

To do that, we not only need to produce energy domestically, we need to work with our closest friend and ally, Canada. At the same time, as we produce that energy, we need the infrastructure to move it to our markets rather than sending it overseas.

So it is ironic on the one hand the Senator is proposing an amendment saying: Oh, no. If we get any of this oil, we have to have all of it. He is making an argument that doesn't work in a global economy, where he is saying if we can't have 100 percent of it every

single day—not one drop leaves—then export all of it. I want 100 percent or nothing.

That doesn't make sense.

The whole point is we have just finished showing that the oil will be used here, and for any of it to be exported we need the Secretary of Commerce's approval. But we have to talk about it in a larger context because this debate we are having isn't only about the Keystone Pipeline, it is about the future of energy security for our country.

Are we going to work to produce oil and gas domestically? Are we going to work with Canada to bring their oil and gas that they produce as well to us, rather than having them export it to China, so we are energy secure?

What I mean by that is we produce more oil and gas in North America than we consume. When we do that we become energy secure. As far as this argument about any kind of other source of energy or renewable, that this somehow precludes it, it doesn't. Let's produce all those other energy sources as well. They are not mutually exclusive.

Preventing us from producing more oil and gas and working with Canada to produce more oil and gas so we don't have to get it from OPEC in no way excludes any other type of energy development. They are not mutually exclusive.

So, yes, let's do it all but don't block this effort to make us energy secure in oil and gas so we don't have to depend upon OPEC. That is the real issue underlying this debate. That is why we have to build this vital infrastructure. Right now when Americans go to the pump, they are paying—I think I saw today the national average is about \$2.05 for gasoline. Why is that?

As I have said before on this floor, it is not because OPEC decided to give us a Christmas present. When OPEC can, they will try to push those gas prices right back up. The reason gas prices at the pump are down now for all our consumers and for all our small businesses is because we are producing more oil and gas at home and we are getting more from Canada.

The United States uses about 18 million barrels per day of oil. Right now we produce about 11 million barrels in the United States. We import another 3 million from Canada. That gets us up to about 14 million, so we are down to only importing about 4 million a day.

If we continue to work with Canada and develop our own energy resources, pretty soon we will be at that point where we produce more energy than we consume, but we have to have this discussion about needing the infrastructure and also our ability to operate in global markets.

I will talk more about that, because if we produce more oil and gas, it puts downward pressure on oil prices on the world market. Most of those world markets are priced off of Brent crude.

As we produce more oil, we not only help ourselves, we help our allies. So

we have to understand what it takes to build an energy plan and do it the right way rather than blocking the very infrastructure and doing the very things that have led to incredible benefits today for our consumers at the pump.

If that were a tax cut, that reduction of more than \$1 in the gas prices is \$100 billion in our consumers' pockets. That is the impact.

So it is about jobs. It is about energy, it is about jobs, it is about growing our economy, it is about national security—but not by blocking these efforts that are benefitting our consumers, making our country stronger, safer, and helping our allies but by continuing to move forward with them.

I look forward to discussing that more and the environmental impact.

One more statistic before I turn to my good colleague from Nebraska. Since 1990, the greenhouse gas emissions from oil sands-produced oil have gone down 28 percent, almost one-third, because in Alberta they are taking huge steps to continue to improve the environmental stewardship of this production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I look forward to discussing that further. I think I have control of the floor time until 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is not controlled.

Mr. HOEVEN. All right. Under prior agreement, I turn to my colleague from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I see my colleague from Minnesota who wanted to speak on his amendment which is pending, and I know our colleague from Nebraska is here. She has been waiting, so I hope before we adjourn we could accommodate both of them.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that we turn to my colleague from Nebraska, and I would be willing to confer, as far as time, to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his comments.

Mr. President, I, too, come to the floor to speak on the great improvements to our economy due to energy production.

The American oil and gas surge has created jobs across this country and renewed investments in infrastructure, transforming many unlikely States and cities into energy hubs for fuel production.

Over the past 5 years alone the United States has increased our domestic supply of oil and gas by 50 percent. In an amazing turnaround the United States is now on track to overtake Saudi Arabia as the world's top oil producer, resulting in the creation of thousands of American jobs and greater savings for consumers.

The natural gas industry has also grown tremendously and in the United States has become one of the world's No. 1 producers.

Across this great Nation we are fortunate to have a diverse portfolio of energy resources, including coal, nuclear, hydroelectric, natural gas, and multiple renewable energy resources such as ethanol, wind, and solar. These resources can be used to improve the lives of all Americans.

American consumers are now blessed with multiple options to obtain the affordable, reliable energy that is being produced in an environmentally responsible manner, but in order to maintain and grow our domestic energy security we need to have policies that support that goal.

Unfortunately, President Obama has given only lip service to an "all of the above" energy strategy while pushing a counteragenda that has restricted domestic production and energy choices. That costs Americans billions of dollars.

Meanwhile, the EPA is taking this anti-American energy agenda to a new level with proposals that jeopardize the affordability and reliability of electricity for all Americans.

The EPA's proposed rule for existing powerplants would force the premature retirement of efficient, low-cost coal-fueled generation, leading to the potential loss of billions of dollars of investments made over the past decade to make coal plants cleaner.

These proposals would make it nearly impossible for the United States—which possesses the world's largest reserves of coal—to continue to utilize this affordable and abundant energy source. Nebraska's families and businesses, which depend on coal-fired generation for nearly two-thirds of their electric needs, are going to be disproportionately penalized under this plan.

Under this administration the Federal Government has quashed energy projects by slow-walking, politicizing, and rejecting routine permits to build energy infrastructure such as the Keystone Pipeline. This important project has the clear capacity to grow our economy and maintain our energy security.

On this floor we have heard many comments during this debate about the Nebraska Legislature and what was done with regard to the Keystone Pipeline. Let me set the record straight. I was in the Nebraska Legislature at that time. In fact, the proposed pipeline route crosses my former legislative district.

By the way, I am a cattle rancher. I live in the Nebraska Sandhills and I live over the Ogallala Aquifer. The legislation was not coerced and the Nebraska Legislature was certainly not confused, as some of my colleagues on the other side have implied.

The Nebraska Legislature is a very open and public process. Every bill—every single bill that is introduced—

has a public hearing, and our citizens are welcome and encouraged to come to those public hearings to express their opinions before legislative committees.

We also have three stages of debate. We have three stages of debate on every single bill before that final vote.

The Nebraska Legislature made decisions dealing with the pipeline siting within our borders.

The bill passed on a 44-to-5 vote. I would also mention that the entire Nebraska congressional delegation—which does include a Democratic Congressman from the Second Congressional District who also served in the Nebraska Legislature—is united in our support for this bill. Last week this bill was called an opening gambit or spin by some of my colleagues.

For the vast majority of Nebraskans, this is about certainty. Nebraskans want a decision made. This has been going on for 6 years. It is time for the President to make a decision.

I am also working on some commonsense amendments to improve the arduous NEPA approval process and to protect private property energy production. I am also going to be offering amendments to set commonsense limitations for Federal land designation.

I am excited about the opportunities we have to pursue policies where we can champion the productive use of America's energy resources in this Congress and where we will be able to capitalize on our country's energy prosperity. I am excited and looking forward to an open amendment process where we can do our jobs, where we can offer amendments, where we can debate those amendments, and most importantly where we can vote because that is the only way we are held accountable to our constituents, the American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURPHY be recognized for up to 5 minutes following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 17

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an amendment I have offered with Senators STABENOW and MANCHIN, which is amendment No. 17 to S. 1. Our amendment recognizes the importance of the iron and steel industries in our country and ensures that if the pipeline is built, it is built with American iron and steel so we can create more jobs and strengthen our economy.

Congress has had a long history of using "Buy American" provisions in order to maximize the economic benefits of infrastructure projects. "Buy American" provisions ensure that more goods and manufactured items used in infrastructure and other projects are

produced here at home. In fact, as recently as 2013 Congress passed a provision in the WRDA Act—the Water Resources Development Act—to require the use of iron, steel, and other domestically produced goods in water infrastructure projects. That is important because it means that we keep jobs and profits here at home instead of sending them abroad.

Unfortunately, there is no such requirement when it comes to construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. In fact, according to TransCanada itself, half of the pipe for the U.S. portion of the pipeline would be sourced from foreign countries. And for the other half that would be put together here in the United States, much of the raw material, such as the steel that goes into the pipe, could be sourced from overseas. This is the problem our amendment addresses. Our amendment would require the use of domestic iron, steel, and other manufactured goods in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, provided the material is readily available and affordable.

If adopted, the amendment would create jobs for iron ore miners, such as the ones across the Iron Range in my State of Minnesota. It would create more jobs for shippers who ship the ore across the Great Lakes or by rail or down the Mississippi River. It would create more jobs for our steelworkers who work in steel mills across this country.

At the same time, we specify in our amendment that these requirements would be implemented consistent with our trade agreements.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said we shouldn't put such restrictions on a private company. But we have to remember that this isn't your typical private company. The underlying bill to authorize the pipeline would throw out the established approval process for the construction of a cross-border pipeline by a foreign corporation. That means all of the important assessments regarding things such as safety and the environment that our Federal agencies might have made on this project are tossed by the wayside. So if Congress is going to intervene on behalf of this foreign company, then the least we can do is to make sure the company building the pipeline uses American-made iron and steel.

This is a very pragmatic amendment. We all have different views on the approval process for this pipeline, and while I believe Congress should not circumvent the approval process we have in place, I think we can all agree that we want jobs here in America. So I invite my colleagues to stand up for our domestic iron and steel producers by supporting my amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I come to the floor to support the amendment which is the pending business on the floor today.

This is only my second session in the Senate, but I imagine that it means something to be Senate bill 1. It probably means something even more to be Senate bill 1 in the new Republican-majority Senate. Why? Because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had 8 years in the minority to think about what should be the first bill, the No. 1 priority of this new Republican Senate, 8 years to think about every problem American families are facing, to vet every possible solution to these problems and decide what is going to be the first bill we are going to debate to make this country a better place. There were a lot of measures the new majority could have chosen. We could have been sitting here talking about a tax cut for the middle class or we could have been talking about a proposal to make college more affordable. We could have been talking about a proposal to grow small businesses all across the country. But we are not talking about those things. After 8 years of stewing over the problems America faces, Senate bill 1 is an oil pipeline.

As my colleagues who are in opposition to the underlying bill have said, this isn't just any oil pipeline; this is a pipeline to ship foreign oil right through the heartland of the United States, most likely on its way to foreign customers. And it is not just any oil; it is the dirtiest oil you can dream up.

Building this pipeline and increasing the development of tar sands in Canada is the pollution equivalent, according to one study, of putting 4 million new cars on North American roads. But not to worry, say many of the proponents of the bill. Admittedly, many dispute some of those underlying studies. But the real point here is jobs. It is about creating jobs here in the United States.

This is a sight which is familiar to every single American. It is a McDonald's franchise. On average, a McDonald's franchise employs about 30 to 40 people. That is nothing to sneeze at. Thirty to forty people having jobs is a big deal. But the Senate doesn't normally worry itself with debating the establishment of a new McDonald's franchise. It is a big deal to a local community, but it is not something that necessarily moves the needle in terms of the national economy. Yet the Keystone Pipeline would create the same number of permanent full-time jobs as the average McDonald's franchise. Yes, it creates construction jobs, and I don't want to discount the fact that it puts a lot of people to work building the pipeline. But do you know what also puts people to work? Building a new high school. Building a new rail line. Improving our crumbling infrastructure. That puts a lot of people to work as well. In the end, the added value to the economy of a new school or a new bridge or a new rail line

dwarfs that of a pipeline which, without the adoption of the Markey amendment to be offered later, will quite possibly just take the oil from one country and send it through the United States to another country—never mind all of the environmental side effects of continuing to develop this oil.

So I am going to oppose the underlying bill, but I am here to support Senator FRANKEN's amendment because if we are going to approve this pipeline, let's do everything we can to ensure that even though we are only going to create 40 full-time jobs, that we are creating as many part-time jobs as possible. That is why it makes sense to require that the iron and steel that are going into this pipeline come from America. And we know we need to pass this amendment because Keystone has already promised that half of the steel and half of the iron is going to come from overseas companies. Mr. President, 330,000 tons of pipeline is going to come from overseas companies.

This concept is not new. We do it all the time. We just passed the WRDA bill with bipartisan consensus. "Buy American" provisions were in there. The American Recovery Act—"Buy American" provisions were in there. We have had laws on the books for a long time that apply "Buy American" provisions to private companies that are doing business in and around industries regulated or funded by the U.S. Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. So this amendment will just make sure that at least in the short-term we are going to put a few more Americans to work, even if we are not going to do anything about the rather paltry economic numbers in the long run.

I am supporting the Franken amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would like to make a couple of points. One is that in regard to this amendment, to my knowledge, they are talking about situations where a project is publicly funded, funded with taxpayer dollars. In this case, I would point out by way of closing that this is roughly an \$8 billion project, but it is privately financed. This isn't a publicly funded project; it is financed by private companies and, in fact, will create hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue—State, local, and Federal Government level—to provide dollars back to the taxpayers, with absolutely no tax increase.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.